

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF NEW JERSEY
CAMDEN VICINAGE

_____)
In Re: VALSARTAN, LOSARTAN, and IRBESARTAN) **19-MD-2875 (RBK-SAK)**
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION)
This document applies to all cases.)
_____)

KUGLER, U.S. District Judge:

CASE MANAGEMENT ORDER NO. 24

The parties jointly seeking by motion (Doc. 1922)¹ that certain deadlines for specific case management events established by Case Management Order No. 23 (Doc. 863) in this Multi-District Litigation be extended, and it appearing procedurally prudent that a new Case Management Order ["CMO"] be issued, which confirms the new deadlines for these events, and

this CMO confirming ONLY those new deadlines for the specific events listed hereinbelow and NOT revising any other deadlines in CMO 23,

IT IS HEREWITH ORDERED THAT:

- Deadline to complete depositions of defendants' class certification experts is **Now moved to 25 March 2022.**
- Deadline for defendants to file oppositions to class certification motions is: **Now moved to 5 April 2022.**
- Deadline to file Daubert motions regarding class certification experts is: **Now moved to 26 April 2022.**
- Deadline for plaintiffs to file replies to oppositions to class certification motions is: **Now moved to 3 May 2022.**
- Deadline to file responses to Daubert motions regarding class certification experts is: **Now moved to 25 May 2022.**

Dated: 25 February 2022

/s Robert B. Kugler
ROBERT B. KUGLER
United States District Judge

¹ The Court offers guidance to the parties when they seek to revise a Case Management Order:

1.0 Each CMO should have its own number in order to unequivocally identify and date the orders issued therein, regardless of whether the CMO is "new" or revising the provisions of a previous one. It is unsuitable procedure to "revise" the provisions of an existing CMO and retain its previous CMO number, even for the issuance of new case management deadlines. Rather, as done here, the preferred procedure is to issue a new Case Management Order.

2.0 In any CMO, the signature line should state the correct name, that is, "Robert B. Kugler". The incorrect name "Robert J. Kugler" listed in the parties' proposed order that accompanied Doc. 1922 prevents the Court from signing it.

3.0 The Court suggests that greater care in preparing any proposed CMO in the future would be helpful.